

REMARKS

Applicant asks that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 33-72 and 74-92 are now pending, of which claims 33, 46, 60, 68, and 75 are independent.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Developing Java Beans, O'Reilly (June 1997) (hereinafter Englander) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Englander in view of

<http://java.sun.com/docs/books/tutorial/jar/basics/manifest.html> (hereinafter java.sun.com).

Applicant addresses the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection over Englander first, and then applicant turns to the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection over Englander in view of java.sun.com below.

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57 and 58

Independent claim 33 recites a method for executing an application that is encapsulated in a package that includes a root archive of files that has an initial file and a manifest that has an initial file identifier that indicates that the initial file is to be processed before the other files in the root archive of files when the application is executed. Among other features, the method includes loading the package within the browser, in response to loading the package within the browser, automatically accessing the manifest, locating the initial file identifier in the manifest, based on the located initial file identifier, accessing the instructions for initiating the execution of the application in the initial file, processing the accessed instructions, and automatically initiating execution of the application based on the processed instructions.

In rejecting independent claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office Action acknowledges that Englander fails to describe or suggest all of the features recited in independent claim 33. In particular, the Office Action acknowledges that:

Englander does not show the manifest including an initial file identifier that indicates that the initial file is to be processed before the other files in the archive of files when the application is executed; in response to loading the package within the browser, automatically accessing the manifest; locating the initial file identifier in the manifest; based on the located initial file identifier, accessing the instructions for initiating the execution of the application in the initial file; processing the accessed instructions; and automatically initiating execution of the application based on the processed instructions.

Office Action of May 4, 2007 at page 4, lines 4-11. Because, as the Office Action acknowledges, Englander fails to describe or suggest these features of independent claim 33, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 33 and its dependent claims, claims 34, 36-39, 41, 42, and 44.

Independent claim 46 recites features that are similar to those discussed above in connection with independent claim 33 and does so in the context of a computer program product. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of independent claim 46 and its dependent claims, claims 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, and 58.

Claims 60-64, 66, and 67

Independent claim 60 recites a method for encapsulating an application in a package such that the application may be automatically executed by a browser on a client computer. Among other features, the method includes generating a root archive of files that includes an initial file that includes instructions for initiating execution of the application and other files needed to execute the application, and generating a manifest file that is associated with the root archive and that includes an initial file identifier that instructs the browser to process the initial file before processing other files in the root archive in order to initiate execution of the application.

In rejecting independent claim 60 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office Action acknowledges that Englander does not describe or suggest all of the features of independent claim 60. In particular, the Office Action acknowledges that:

Englander does not show the archive including: an initial file that includes instructions for initiating execution of the application, and the manifest file including an initial file identifier that instructs the browser to process the initial file before processing other files in the archive in order to initiate execution of the application.

Office Action of May 4, 2007 at page 10, lines 15-18. Because, as the Office Action acknowledges, Englander fails to describe or suggest these features of independent claim 60, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 60 and its dependent claims, claims 61-64 and 66-70.

Claims 68-70, 72, and 74

Independent claim 68 recites a self-contained package for distributing an application that includes, among other features, a root archive including an initial content source having instructions for initiating execution of the application within the browser environment and additional files that include instructions and content needed to execute the application within the browser environment, and a manifest associated with the root archive that includes an initial content identifier that indicates that the initial content source is to be processed before the additional files in the root archive when the application is executed.

In rejecting independent claim 68 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Office Action acknowledges that Englander does not describe or suggest all of the features of independent claim 68. In particular, the Office Action acknowledges that:

Englander does not show where the .jar file includes an initial content identifier that indicates the initial content source is to be processed before the additional files in the archive when the application is executed.

Office Action of page 13, lines 15-17.¹ Because, as the Office Action acknowledges, Englander fails to describe or suggest a root archive including an initial content source having instructions for initiating execution of the application within the browser environment, as recited in

¹ Applicant notes that this quotation from the Office Action does not track the claim language of previously presented independent claim 68 exactly. Nevertheless, applicant's quotation of this passage from the Office Action is not intended to be an acquiescence to the Office Action's characterization of features recited in independent claim 68.

independent claim 68, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 68 and its dependent claims, claims 69, 70, 72, and 74.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74

As discussed above, claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Englander in view of java.sun.com. Applicant has amended independent claims 33, 46, 60, and 68 and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58, 60-64, 66-70, 72, and 74 because none of Englander, java.sun.com, or any proper combination of Englander and java.sun.com describes or suggests all of the features recited in amended independent claims 33, 46, 60, and 68.

Claims 33, 34, 36-39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, 58

Independent claim 33 recites a method for executing an application that is encapsulated in a package. As amended, independent claim 33 recites, among other features, loading, within a browser on a local client computer, a package that includes a manifest and a root archive of files that includes an initial file that includes instructions for initiating execution of the application, other files needed to execute the application, and a nested archive of additional files nested within the root archive of files.

Englander appears to be a reference guide that describes the JavaBeans architecture for using and building components in Java. See, e.g., Englander at Section 1.2. The JavaBeans Architecture. In addition, Englander describes using JAR files to bundle JavaBeans and related Java support classes. See, e.g., Englander at Chapter 6. JAR Files. Similarly, java.sun.com appears to be a tutorial that explains how to use JAR files. Importantly, while both Englander and java.sun.com describe JAR files, neither Englander nor java.sun.com describes or suggests a root archive of files that includes a nested archive of additional files nested within the root

archive of files, as recited in independent claim 33. Consequently, none of Englander, java.sun.com, or any proper combination of Englander and java.sun.com describes or suggests loading, within a browser on a local client computer, a package that includes a manifest and a root archive of files that includes a nested archive of additional files nested within the root archive of files, as recited in independent claim 33. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 33 and its dependent claims, claims 34, 36-39, 41, 42, and 44.

Independent claim 46 recites features that are similar to those discussed above in connection with independent claim 33 and does so in the context of a computer program product. Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 46 and its dependent claims, claims 47, 49-52, 54, 55, 57, and 58.

Claims 60-64, 66, and 67

Independent claim 60 recites a method for encapsulating an application in a package such that the application may be automatically executed by a browser on a client computer that includes, among other features, generating a root archive of files that includes a nested archive of additional files nested within the root archive of files. As discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, neither Englander nor java.sun.com describes or suggests a root archive of files that includes a nested archive of additional files nested within the root archive of files, as recited in independent claim 60. Consequently, none of Englander, java.sun.com, or any proper combination of Englander and java.sun.com describes or suggests generating a root archive of files that includes a nested archive of additional files nested within the root archive of files, as recited in independent claim 60. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 60 and its dependent claims, claims 61-64, 66, and 67.

Claims 68-70, 72, and 74

Independent claim 68 recites a self-contained package for distributing an application. Among other features, the self-contained package includes a root archive including a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive of files. As discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, neither Englander nor java.sun.com describes or suggests a root archive including a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive of files, as recited in independent claim 68. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claim 68 and its dependent claims, claims 69, 70, 72, and 74.

Claims 43 and 56

Dependent claim 43, which depends from independent claim 33, and dependent claim 56, which depends from independent claim 46, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,617,526 (hereinafter Oran). However, Oran does not cure the deficiencies in Englander noted above in connection with independent claims 33 and 46. Accordingly, at least because of their dependencies and the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claims 33 and 46, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 43 and 56.

Claims 75-77 and 79

Claims 75-77 and 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,065,024 (hereinafter Renshaw).

Independent claim 75 recites a web browser configured to receive and execute an application encapsulated in a self-contained package. Among other features, the web browser includes an input module for inputting a self-contained package that includes a root archive having a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive. As discussed above in connection with independent claim 33, Englander does not describe or suggest a root archive having a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive. Like Englander, Renshaw

also fails to describe or suggest a root archive having a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive. Rather, Renshaw describes a method and system for rendering embedded HTML documents in a visual display. See Renshaw at Abstract. Therefore, none of Englander, Renshaw, or any proper combination of Englander and Renshaw describes or suggests a web browser including an input module for inputting a self-contained package that includes a root archive having a nested archive of other files nested within the root archive, as recited in independent claim 75. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 75 and its dependent claims, claims 76, 77, and 79.

Claim 78

Dependent claim 78, which depends from independent claim 75, has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766 (hereinafter Bates).² However, Bates does not cure the deficiencies in Englander and Renshaw noted above in connection with independent claim 75. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 78 at least because of its dependency and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 75.

Claims 80 and 81

Dependent claims 80 and 81, each of which depends from independent claim 75, have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836 (hereinafter Rowe).³ However, Rowe

² Applicant notes that the Office Action does not actually specify that the Bates reference corresponds to U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766. Rather, the Office Action merely indicates that "[c]laim 78 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw as applied to claim 77 above, and further in view of Bates et al." Office Action of May 4, 2007 at page 18, lines 12-14. Nevertheless, due to the fact that the Form PTO-892 that was provided with the Office Action identifies the Bates reference as corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766, applicant understands the Bates reference to correspond to U.S. Patent No. 5,877,766.

³ Applicant notes that the Office Action does not actually specify that the Rowe reference corresponds to U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836. Rather, the Office Action merely indicates that "[c]laims 80 and 81 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

does not cure the deficiencies in Englander and Renshaw noted above in connection with independent claim 75. Accordingly, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 80 and 81 at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claim 75.

New Claims

New claims 82-92 each depend from one of independent claims 33, 46, 60, 68 and 75. Accordingly, applicant submits that new claims 82-92 are allowable at least because of their dependencies and for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent claims 33, 46, 60, 68, and 75.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

The fee in the amount of \$500 in payment of the Excess Claims Fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.


103(a) as being unpatentable over Englander in view of Renshaw as applied to claim 75 above, and further in view of Rowe et al." Office Action of May 4, 2007 at page 19, lines 1-3. Nevertheless, due to the fact that the Form PTO-892 that was provided with the Office Action identifies the Rowe reference as corresponding to U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836, applicant understands the Rowe reference to correspond to U.S. Patent No. 5,964,836.

Applicant : Daniel P. Veditz
Serial No. : 09/163,041
Filed : September 29, 1998
Page : 25 of 25

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-721001 / 97-870

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 6, 2007



Andrew T. Foy
Reg. No. 57,333

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40435985.doc